ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿದಲ್ಲಿ, ಡೆಲ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡ್ಮೂದರೂ ಈ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಚಾಲೆಂಜ್ ಆಗಿ ಈ ಪ್ರೊವಿಜನ್ ಅಪ್‌ಹೆರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಇದಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀರ್.—ಆಗ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಛಾಲೆಂಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ನನಗೆ ಅದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಛಾಲೆಂಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಇದೇ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಯರ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ರಾ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ರಾ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಲೀಗರ್ ಅಡ್ವೈಜ್ ಏನಿತ್ತು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟು ಇರಾಖಾ ಮೋಜ್ಕೆ ನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಸಲಹೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾದಾಗ ಅವರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ರಿಮೆಡಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment moved by the Hon. Member Sri L. Srikantiah to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the City of Bangalore Muncipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1969, be referred to a Select Committee."

The motion was negatived.

CLAUSE 2

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 3

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to clause 3:—

"That for the words, 'as early as possible' after the words 'shall be held' in the proposed Section 30A, the words 'within 15 days' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That for the words, 'as early as possible' after the words 'shall be held' in the proposed Section 30A, the words 'within 15 days' shall be substituted."

There is also an amendment to this Clause by Sri D. B. Kalmankar. But, the hon. Member is not present.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ನಲಹೆ. ಇಲ್ಲ 15 ದಿವಸ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳು ಎಂದು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿ. ಅಂತೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಗೊಳಿಸುವುದು ಉತ್ತಮ. I hope the Hon'ble Minister for Municipal Administration will accept this amendment in the interest of better working of the law.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That for the words, 'as early as possible' after the words 'shall be held' in the proposed Section 30A, the words 'within 15 days' shall be substituted. "

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That Clause 3 do stand part of the Bill. "

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSES 4 and 5.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That Clauses 4 and 5 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 4 and 5 were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 6.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN:—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to Clause 6, *viz.*,

" The following proviso shall be added to the proposed sub-section 1 'Provided that the Government may add to the schedule any rules as are deemed necessary in connection with the elections'. "

Mr. SPEAKER:—Amendment moved :

" That the following proviso shall be added to the proposed sub-section 1 'Provided that the Government may add to the schedule any rules as are deemed necessary in connection with the elections'. "

† Sri M. S. KRISHNAN :—Sir, as far as this is concerned, I have already spoken at length and I don't think I need repeat it. The only purpose was to see that the Rule is flexible enough so that it may give flexibility to amend it, if they deem it necessary. If it is a part of the Act itself, any amendment will have to be brought before the House. That is why I have moved it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿವರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the following proviso shall be added to the proposed sub-section 1 'Provided that the Government may add to the schedule any rules as are deemed necessary in connection with the elections'."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 7

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Hon. Member Sri D. B. Kalmankar, but the Hon. Member is absent. Therefore, I will put the Clause to vote.

The question is :

"That Clause 7 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Sri M. N. RAMANNA (Turuvekere) —I rise to a Point of Order. The hon. member Sri Aziz Sait is sitting on the Congress side and is saying 'No' when the Chair put the Clause to vote. Please direct the member to sit in his seat and say whatever he wants to say.

Sri AZIZ SAIT (Narasimharaja).—Sir, when the same question was raised, the late Speaker Sri B. V. Baliga, said that Aziz Sait is an identifiable person and can sit anywhere. It is the Ruling of the late Speaker and every one has to honour it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is better that the hon. member goes and sits in his seat.

Sri AZIZ SAIT.—Sir, I am not speaking !

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does not the Hon. member want to exercise his vote on the clauses ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಕುಳಿತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It seems as though he has got a special attraction for the seat !

Sri AZIZ SAIT.—It is a little comfortable, Sir.

5-00 P.M.

CLAUSE 8.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I beg to move the following amendment :

" That in line three of Section 61 of the principal Act after the word 'elections' the words 'not later than one month' shall be inserted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The amendment moved :

" In line three of Section 61 of the principal Act after the word 'elections' the words 'not later than one month' shall be inserted."

†Sri M. NAGAPPA.—If we read that particular clause, there is no clear date given. According to the democratic principles adopted in this country, we feel some time limit should be fixed. When the Corporation was superseded we were anxiously awaiting the red letter day for holding elections. We have many times on the floor of the House, as well as outside, requested the Chief Minister and other Ministers to consider the issue of holding election to the Corporation as early as possible. If you read clause 61, it reads as follows :

" Vacancies arising by efflux of time in the Office of Divisional Councillor shall be filled at ordinary elections, which shall be fixed by the Commissioner to take place on such days in the months of November and December immediately preceding the vacancies as he thinks fit."

If you delete the words "in the months of November and December immediately", the purpose for which the clause is meant will not be served. Therefore I submit, the words I have brought forward in my amendment, are very essential. The amendment brought forward by the Government will be meaningless. Therefore I request my amendment may be accepted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಮೊದಲು ಕ್ಲಾಜು 61ರಲ್ಲಿ ನವಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಡಿಸಂಬರ್—ಈ ಎರಡು ತಿಂಗಳುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಬೇರೆ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲಾದರೂ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ನೂಪರ್ ಫ್ಲುಯಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"that in line three of Section 61 of the principle Act after the word 'elections' the words 'not later than one month' shall be inserted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 8 do stand Part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 8 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 9.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—I beg to move :

"That in the proposed amendment, after item e (2), the following item shall be added :

"buildings or lands used for development of art, culture, literary development and for educating the public in civic affairs or other institutions purely meant for public service provided that such bodies are registered and the accounts of such body are duly audited and published to show that the institutions are not established for profit."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in the proposed amendment, after item e (2), the following item shall be added :

"buildings or lands used for development of art, culture, literary development and for educating the public in civic affairs or other institutions purely meant for public service provided that such bodies are registered and the accounts of such body are duly audited and published to show that the institutions are not established for profit."

†**Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.**—Sir, permit me to say that the Hon. Minister or the Government have partially conceded the request of charitable institutions in respect of grant-in-aid Institutions and exempted them from property tax. According to the present amendment, the buildings and lands owned by free hostels and educational institutions are exempted. In the original Act, there was no exemption to these Institutions, but by convention, they were not being taxed. Now a specific provision has been made to give exemption to educational Institutions and Hostels which deserve this concession provided they are maintained by charities and also by grant of the Government. But some of the Institutions are swindling the public charities and they

(SRI T. R. SHAMANNA)

misuse the grant given. In such cases care should be taken to see that this concession should not be extended to these institutions. There are some institutions working for the public good. Take for example, Kannada Sahithya Parishat, the Gokhale Institute and such other institutions are working for the benefit of the public. These Institutions which are meant for public service will have to be taken into consideration. The accounts of these institutions should be duly audited. As far as the Educational Institutions are concerned, the exemption should be there, because some of these Institutions are run purely on public charities. Under these circumstances, this exemption may be extended to those Institutions purely meant for public service, provided they are registered and their accounts are audited and established that they are not for profit. Therefore under these circumstances, the amendment brought forward deserves sympathetic consideration.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Let the Corporation do it. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನವರು ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ.—ಈಗ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಕತ್ತು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಲೈಬ್ರೆರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ಏಕದಂ ಕತ್ತು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಷ್ಟೇ. ಜನಗಳ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ವಿನಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—I wholeheartedly support the amendment of Sri Shamanna. His contention is the Government is trying to give exemption to all buildings, or lands exclusively used for educational Institutions receiving grant-in-aid from the Government.

Hon'ble, Mr. Shamanna was pleased to cite the instance of Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs and other charitable institutions. I wonder whether the Corporation authority should take power to exempt such institutions! If such institutions are registered for the benefit of public in the field of Art, cultural development, etc., I think they should be exempted, subject to one proviso which I would like to add, *i.e.*, if that institution has sublet a portion of that building for making profit, to that extent only the Corporation may intervene and ask them to pay tax. But a public body like the Gokhale Institute of Public Affairs which is purely meant for a public purpose and whose financial position depends upon the collection of donations and which is hardly be able to pay the salaries of a Secretary or a peon, should be exempted from payment of tax.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN (Malleswaram).— Sir, I am supporting Mr. Shamanna's amendment. The original clause consisted of a lengthy list. But now some of those things are omitted and only hostels and educational institutions have been proposed to be exempted from payment of tax. I do not see why other charitable institutions which mainly depend upon public donations for maintenance should not be

exempted from the payment of tax. Just now, the Hon. Minister suggested that the Corporation may give grants to such institutions, If grants could be given to these institutions, I think the same thing should apply to other institutions also. The point here is whether these particular institutions are to be exempted or not by virtue of the character and nature of the institutions. That is why I am supporting Mr. Shamanna's amendment and I request the Hon'ble Minister atleast to accept this particular amendment in the interest of the other charitable public institutions.

SRI B. M. PATIL.—Sir, we have exempted educational and other institutions as a class and a category. The financial position of the institution has been the criteria for exemptions. In the present case, it is very difficult to include all classes of institutions in that category. Therefore, at this moment, I am unable to accept the amendment of Hon'ble Member Mr. Shamanna.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now, I shall put the amendment of hon. Member Mr. Shamanna to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That in the proposed amendment, in clause 9, after item e(2), the following item shall be added:

"buildings or lands used for development of art, culture, literary development and for educating the public in civic affairs or other institutions purely meant for public service, provided that such bodies are registered and the accounts of such body are duly audited and published to show that the institutions are not established for profit."

The amendment was negatived.

Now, I shall put clause 9 to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That clause 9 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSE 9 WAS ADDED TO THE BILL.

CLAUSE 10

MR. SPEAKER.—There are amendments to clause 10. I call upon Hon. Members Sri Nagappa and Sri T. R. Shamanna to move their amendments.

SRI M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That in the proposed sub-section 3 of Section 104 of the Principle Act, for the words 'thirty days' the words 'sixty days' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

" That in the proposed sub-section 3 of section 10 of the Principle Act, for the words ' thirty days ' the words ' sixty days ' shall be substituted. "

† Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, according to the Act, the property tax has to be paid by the person against whom tax has been assessed, within thirty days after the commencement of every half-year. If this sub-clause was only there in the Bill it would not have caused any harassment to the assessee or the tax-payer. But immediately after sub-clause (3) there is sub-clause (4) wherein if the assessee fails to pay within thirty days he is liable to pay a penalty at the rate of five per cent of the amount of tax remaining unpaid. Therefore Sir, there being a penal clause, at least the Government must be in a position to give a sufficient time to pay the taxes. In the best interest of the recovery of taxes, if the Government were to liberally increase the time-limit from thirty days to sixty days, I think they would be doing some justice to the people. Therefore, I submit that this is an amendment which is help ful to the public and may be accepted.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to clause 10 :—

"That for the proposed sub-section (4), the following sub-section shall be substituted :

" If default is made in making payment with the close of that half year, the person liable to pay the tax shall pay a penalty at the rate of five per cent of the amount of tax remaining unpaid after the said six months for which the tax is due. "

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

" That for the proposed sub-section (4), the following sub-section shall be substituted :

' If default is made in making payment with the close of that half year, the person liable to pay the tax shall pay a penalty at the rate of five per cent of the amount of tax remaining unpaid after the said six months for which the tax is due. "

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—Sir, the purpose of moving this amendment is according to the present clause as proposed in the amendment Bill, soon after thirty days after the tax falls due the assessee will have to pay a penalty of five per cent, in case of default to pay the tax as per the stipulated time, *viz.*, after 30th April and after 31st October. Now the assessment is made in advance and the tax is payable for 1969 in advance and even that is to be paid half-yearly.

And then, after the half year is over, it is a legitimate penalty and it may be collected. But when the tax is paid in advance, the penalty accrues at present immediately after 30 days even at the beginning of the relevant half year. This penalty clause was introduced with a view to see that people do not keep large amount of arrears and they pay up their dues in time. Now what has happened is the very purpose with which this Act was amended some years ago is defeated. As I already narrated, after the introduction of this penalty clause, the percentage of tax collection is going down year by year. A prudent person who is trading on borrowed capital rather prefers to pay penalty rather than paying a higher rate of interest on his borrowed money. The bank rate normally is 10 per cent. Instead of paying ten per cent here, he would rather see that the tax accumulates and he prefers to pay at a later date some small penalty at 5 per cent. This is fully borne out by the following figures relating to the collection of property tax by the Corporation :

In—1962-63	...	77	per cent
1963-64	...	78	per cent
1964-65	...	65	per cent
1965-66	...	59	per cent
1966-67	...	57	per cent
1967-68	...	56	per cent

It will be seen from this statement that the percentage has gone down from 79 in 1961-62 to 56 per cent in 1967-68. The natural inference that could be drawn from this is that the very object of introducing this penalty clause is nullified. It may be a fact that the quantum of money collected as tax has increased and that is because the rate of tax is increased, the number of houses has increased and therefore we have got an increased amount collected as tax. But the percentage as such has fallen. I want to bring to your notice, not only the Corporation has not benefited by this, but at the same time, innocent people are also harassed on account of this penalty clause. Therefore, I am suggesting that this levy of penalty would be legitimate if it is levied after the period of six months are over and the tax-payer will not consider it unfair. This suggestion I am making is in the interest of proper collection is and I am quite definite that I have brought this amendment in order to help proper collection of taxes.

Our friends on the other side are not tired of saying that we here have always a tendency to oppose every measure. Even if good suggestions are made, because it is brought by Members of the Opposition, those friends do not want to accept. That is the fate here. The only option left to us on the opposition is to creats an occasion by bringing some amendment and have the satisfaction of expressing our views on that subject into Trust that this suggestion of mine will be accepted by the Government.

† Sri B. M. PATIL.—Sir, I am sorry the arguments advanced by my friends are not convincing. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Member to the following proviso :

" Provided the Commissioner may, if in his opinion there is sufficient cause for the delay in making pay nent of the property tax remit the whole or any part of the penalty payable in respect of any half year by any person. "

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—I want to ask the hon. Minister in how many cases has such exemption been granted ? It is not usually granted at all except where they are interested. Exemption is given in no other case. I should have touched upon this point also, but I had not much time. I am sorry to say that exemptions are not given by the Commissioner.

Sri B. M. PATIL.—Probably they are not reasonable cases. In all reasonale cases, the Commissioner has the authority to remit. My hon. friend has suggested that the penalty clause will induce tax-payers to keep the tax in arrears. He said that an individual who is now taxed, may prefer to keep the tax in arrears. If that is the tendency, even after the six months period, tax-payers will continue to keep arrears Sir, I feel that the period of 30 days now stipulated is reasonable and adequate.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall now put the amendment of Mr. Nagappa to vote. The question is :

" That in the proposed sub-section 3 of section 104 of the Principal Act, for the words " thirty days " the words " sixty days " may be substituted.

The amendment was negatived.

I will now put the amendment of Sri T. R. Shamanna.

The question is :

" That for the proposed sub-section, (b) the following sub-section shall be substituted:

" If default is made in making payment with the close of that half year, the person liable to pay the tax shall pay a penalty at the rate of five per cent of the amount of tax remaining unpaid after the said six months for which the tax is due. "

The Amendments was negatived.

I shall now put the clause to the House. The question is :

" That clause 10 do stand part of the Bill. "

The otion was adopted.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 11

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Sri L. Srikantiah.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—Sir I beg to move :

"That the following proviso shall be added to clause 4 of schedule viii :

"Provided that no amendment, transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that division and before the completion of that election."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That the following proviso shall be added to clause 4 of schedule viii :

"Provided that no amendment, transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that division and before the completion of that election."

† **Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.**—Sir, in support of this amendment, I have to say that the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the rules framed under the amendment were exhaustive and were modelled after the electoral rules framed under the Representation of the Peoples Act.

Before I speak on this amendment, I wish to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister to clause 2 also. I am pointing out how we land ourselves in a quandry. Incidentally let me say, I had no time to bring in a suitable amendment. I do not know why the Hon. Minister was not pleased to refer this to the Select Committee. The matter is referred to the District Judge as the appellate authority. Supposing the district court takes a strong line and his name is excluded. He files a writ petition and if the writ petition is upheld, the entire election is quashed and the entire election is held void. In the same way, suppose a nomination paper is rejected illegally and later on, the person agrieved files a writ petition stating that the returning officer has not validly and legally rejected the election paper, the whole election is set aside by the Court. Likewise in sub-clause (2) no limit is placed with the appellate authority as to in what time he has to come to a decision and see that electoral roll becomes final. Nowhere in the rules the finality of electoral roll is mentioned. We know very well that innumerable writ petitions are pending because supplementary voters list was given to the candidates just a day prior to election and we do not know what the High Court says in the matter. So, with abundant caution I have brought this amendment. In rule 4 no time limit is fixed for the Commissioner to prepare supplementary voters list. Now that the rules are made on the model of the Representation of People's Act, the salutary clause in that Act is not at all found in these rules.

(SRI L. SRIKANTAIAH)

5-30 P.M.

At this stage I recall to my mind the objection raised by my friend Sri Nagappa. Rules cannot be made part and parcel of the Act. It may be that tomorrow the Commissioner may find some difficulty. He cannot frame a rule. It has to come before the Assembly. If you say prescribe here the form for filing objection and all that, later on if a voter goes to the Commissioner and says he wants to be registered as a voter and asks for the form, here the form is not prescribed. For a simple drafting of a form, he has to come to the Assembly. The whole purpose would be vitiated and we will land ourselves in a soup later on. I want to press this amendment that in case the Commissioner prepares the supplementary list, a time limit should be fixed. If this is not done, we will again land ourselves in a court of law.

† SRI M. NAGAPPA.—In support of the amendment, I wish to submit one thing. According to the Representation of People's Act, Electoral Rules have been framed. If we see those rules, we find that the electoral roll has to be annually revised; finality of the list is also to be decided according to rules. But such rules are not found here. Apart from that if any voter has to enter his name if his name is omitted, there is no rule provided in the schedule appended here. How can that difficulty be over ruled and by which authority? Nothing is mentioned. With these rules and the law which is now being passed, I definitely say with full sense of responsibility, that you may not be able to conduct the elections unless you again come before the House and make suitable amendments to the rules of the Act. I charge the Government that it is an eye-wash by saying that people wanted and that you are very eager to conduct elections. In fact by these rules you are not in a position to hold elections and at every stage there will be difficulty. As we all know even though the Legislative Assembly electoral rolls have been admitted in several Acts, they have been challenged and a number of petitions are pending. Can we hold elections on such rolls when there is no provision for any officer of the Government to change that particular rule—to add certain words to that rule? It is impossible. For everything they have to come before the House. It is unfortunate that we are passing such a Bill which we cannot implement. There is still time because the entire Bill has not been put to vote and third reading is still there. The Government can reconsider and I hope proper solution will be put forward by the Government.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—I have brought forward an amendment to clause 6 of the amending Bill. It speaks of schedule 8 and when I brought it, it was with the intention of saying that it would be a subordinate legislation and that it would not give powers to the Government to change rules. Even if you strictly adhere to the electoral rolls under the Representation of the People's Act, it may be that it will

create more and more complicated problems and a number of writ petitions. Under these circumstances it is better that such things are rectified and these rules are not made part of the Act. The Government says that they have taken legal opinion. The legal opinion of the Government is not always the last opinion. As we know there is another opinion given by the courts. The Courts have held that the Government's legal opinion is wrong. Recently in the case of City Improvement Trust Board, a stricture has been passed on the legal opinion given by the Government department. That particular schedule need not be there. Even now I would urge upon the Minister to accept the amendment of Sri L. Srikantiah so that the harm may be mitigated.

† SRI D. B. KALMANKAR.—Instead of making so many lengthy provisions, inserting schedule 8 in the Act itself, my submission is that better thing would have been to say as in the People's Representation Act. In the Representation of the people's Act there is already provision for the electoral roll for Mysore Legislative Assembly for the time being in force. Under that Act rules are framed and there is provision wherein it is stated that the voters that appear in the voters list, will be entitled to vote or whose names appear in the voters list before the calendar of events is announced. Thereby a provision is made and the inclusion of names in the electoral roll after the publication of calendar of event is precluded. Since such a provision was made with regard to the conduct of Panchayat and Taluk Board elections, names were included in the voters' list even after the calendar of events was published. The result was, the candidates did not have any change to contact the voters included at the last moment. Every candidate is expected to contact the voters; otherwise he will be at a disadvantage. In the recent election to the Taluk Boards, there are instances where persons aged 12 and 14 have been included in the electoral roll and bogus voting was indulged in. While the candidate is concentrating all his attention on propaganda, these voters are introduced in the voters' list through the back door.

Section 14 of the Municipal Act is defective. So many writ petitions have been filed for striking down Section 14 and those petitions are pending in the High Court. Therefore, there should be a provision banning inclusion of names in the voters' list within 45 days' of the date of the election. Then elections will be held in the true democratic spirit. There will be no malpractices which were found to be rampant in the recent elections. Hundreds of writ petitions have been filed complaining of malpractices in the elections. Let not the Government be Adamant. The suggestion of Sri Srikantiah is very salutary. His amendment may not be properly worded but it may be set right. I request that this particular provision may be incorporated in the Act.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ತಿಮ್ಮಯ್ಯ (ಬನವನಗುಡಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಕ್ಕೊರರ್ ರೋಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ತಿಮ್ಮಯ್ಯ)

ಕಳೆದ ಹದಿನಾಲ್ಕು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನೋಡುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಬ್ಲಾಕುಗಳನ್ನೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಂತೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾವುದೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಶಿಸ್ತಿನಿಂದ ನಿಯಮಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿನ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಇರಾಖೆಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಲೇಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗದಂತೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಏರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರನ್ನೇ ಕೈ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಜುನಾವಣೆಯಾದಾಗ ನಾನೇ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಜಲಪುರಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ವೋಟುಗಳು ಅವು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರಿಂದ ವೋಟುಗಳು ಹೇಗೆ ಬಂದವು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಯಿತು. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಜುನಾವಣೆಗಳು ಆಗುವಂತೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮ ಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಏರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ 5,000 ವೋಟರುಗಳು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಏರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿ 20,000 ವೋಟರುಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅನಮಾನವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲ ಏರಿಯಾಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮವಾಗಿ ವೋಟರುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲರುವ ಕ್ಲಾರ್ಕುಗಳೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಷ್ಟು ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಕಾರ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆ ನೀಡಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಜನತೆಗೆ ದೊರಕುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Sri B. P. GANGADHAR (Tumkur).—This is a very important matter with far-reaching consequences. The Government should not stand on prestige on these issues. It should be the endeavour of all of us to see that elections are held fairly and justly ; without creating any complications. Such complications arose very recently and number of writ petitions are even now pending before the High Court. There is scope to include voters till the very last day. The voters and the electoral roll can be manipulated by interested officers. I am not casting aspersion on any officer. Even the highest officer held in great esteem should not have the discretion or power to include names in the electoral rolls after a certain appointed day. Otherwise there will be scope to import number of persons from outside for voting purposes. The hon. Speaker may not be aware of what happened in several municipal areas of the State. Voters were transported from outside places in number of buses and lorries. It was a shameful sight to see this type of malpractice. Such things will be repeated in the Bangalore Corporation elections also. There are chances for manipulation of the voters' list and introducing number of begus voters ; in which case, there will not be any genuine election. Moreover, when the candidates' attention is concentrated on propaganda, if voters are multiplied, they will have no time to post themselves with the uptodate list ; they will not contact them and they are likely to lose their support. During the period when candidates are engaged in propaganda, their attention should not be diverted by going on adding names endlessly. In the recent municipal election at Tumkur, even on the last day, without the knowledge of the candidates, in a particular constituency, the names of 2,200 voters were included in the electoral roll. It was a surprise for a particular candidate. The Municipal Office will not have time even to get the roll printed. They

engage a number of clerks and prepare it in manuscript and supply to the officers in charge of polling booths. This happened in the recent Municipal elections at Tumkur. Except the candidate who was responsible for introducing these new voters, none others knew of the fact of additions to the electoral roll. So the other candidates were in great handicap in that they did know who the new voters were. Therefore a restriction must be imposed and the last date for inclusion of names in the voters' list should be prescribed in the Bill. On a particular day prior to the election, there should be a finality to the electoral roll; this day should be prior to the date of filing of nomination papers. Then there will be some sanctity to the electoral rolls. If there is no time limit for the preparation and finalisation of the voters' list, there will be chances for the candidates to manipulate the electoral rolls to their advantage. The interested candidate will not hesitate to spend eight annas per voter, have him included in the voters' list and practically purchase him. There are occasions when a candidate has purchased 2,000 stamp papers, secretly introduced 2,000 new voters without the knowledge of the other candidates and put others under severe handicap. So much so on the date of polling he will bring these persons in buses and lorries. This has happened in connection with elections to many local bodies and it may happen in future also. I therefore request the Government not to stand on prestige on this matter. Justice must be done to the electorate and the elections must be free and fair. Finality must be reached regarding manufacture of electoral rolls and a time limit has to be prescribed. If that is not done, I warn the Government that it will lead to chaos and confusion. Already writ petitions are pending in the High Court in regard to this matter and if this is not done, it will open the floodgates of litigation. Government may consider this clause, though not the other clauses, and see that inclusion of voters in the electoral roll must stop a week or at least two days before filing of nominations.

† SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, the hon. Member Sri Nagappa charged the Government with almost insincerity by saying that they are not anxious to hold the elections. I am sorry for those remarks made by him. The Hon. Minister of state for Municipal Administration has made clear the anxiety of Government to hold elections as early as as possible. He has made out a case why clause 11 is necessary. He also brought to the notice of the hon. House the filing of several writ petitions challenging certain provisions of the Municipal Act. That has nacessiated the change in the electral roll maintained on the basis of the Representation of Peoples Act and the preparation of a separate electoral roll. So far as this is concerned, I think it was very uncharitable on the part of the hon. Member to have laid that charge at the door of the Government. Government are aware of a similar provision in the Representation of the People Act. Government also realised that it is a very salutary provision which is very necessary. There seems to be an impression in this Hon. House that

(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY)

the Government cannot put in such a provision by their rule-making power. It is that which has made the hon. Members very much irritated. They seem to feel that Government has no power to add such a provision in this rule. It was stated that Government are bringing this enactment and that after some time they will again come before the House with an amendment and this is only to gain time. It is very uncharitable to make any such suggestion. In this connection section 365 (3) of the Municipal Corporation Act of 1949 says that Government may make rules altering or adding or cancelling any of the schedules to this Act except schedule I, Schedule VI and Schedule VII. The rules relating to election come under Schedule VIII. Therefore, Government have a right to add to the rules in Schedule VIII or modify or even cancel any of the rules. As pointed by the hon. Sri Srikantiah, these rules are not exhaustive. So many forms will have to be prescribed. We will have to invoke the rule-making power to complete the election rules. These are only broad guide lines. The suggestion that the Government will find itself in a blind alley and that they will not be able to modify the rule is not correct. I contend that it is open to the Government to invoke the rulemaking power under section 365 (3) of the Municipal Corporation Act and add to the rules in Schedule VIII. I for one would feel that it is not very necessary, but all the same it is a very salutary provision. I thank the hon'ble member Sri Srikantiah for having brought this to the notice of the House pointedly. Once we accepted it, the question is where it should come. Should it come as a proviso to clause 4 of Schedule VIII. There are several rules in Schedule VIII. Clause 3 relates to completion of Municipal electoral roll ; clause 4 relates to supplementary electoral rolls. Clause 5 relates to completion of supplementary electoral rolls and clause 6 relates to consolidation of supplementary rolls. So, it cannot come as a proviso to sub-clause 4. I for one would feel that it should come as a last rule as follows :—

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in rules 1 to 6, no amendment, transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that division and before the completion of that election."

Such a provision is there in the Representation of Peoples Act. Every one of us realises the necessity of having such a provision in this Bill. There can be no objection if such a salutary rule comes as part of the Schedule.

6-00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—So does the hon. Minister want to move any amendment to that effect himself ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Now that it becomes an official amendment, if you will please condone the delay; I would like to move an amendment. I beg to move :

"That the end of Rule 6 of Schedule VIII add the following :

"Notwithstanding anything contained in rules 1 to 6 no amendment, transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that Division and before the completion of that election."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That at the end of rule 6 of Schedule VIII add the following :

"Notwithstanding anything contained in rules 1 to 6 no amendment transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that division and before the completion of that election."

†Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—There is also another matter which it is my duty to bring to your notice. That is under sub-rule (2) of rule 2 which says that applications under sub-rule (1) shall be heard by the District Judge, who after such inquiry as he deems necessary shall make such order for correcting the list or otherwise as shall deem to him fit, and his order shall be conclusive. If you prescribe a time limit, I am quite sure you cannot impose a time limit on the District Judge. Suppose the District Judge gives his finding after the election is held that the order passed by the Commissioner is wrong and directing him to include his name in the electoral roll. Then will not the whole election be held to be void ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I submit that it would not be held void. The existence of this new rule will be brought to the notice of the District Judge and I am sure that every District Judge will dispose of this application well in time.

†Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Till the last day of filing nomination papers amendments, deletions and omissions can be made to the electoral roll. Suppose on the last day a certain name is included in the electoral roll and a person files an objection before the District Judge that the particular name should not be included. The application will have to be heard by the District Judge. When should the District Judge give his finding in the matter ? He will require at least some time to go through the formalities even if he wants to dispose of the application very quickly knowing fully well that it is an urgent election matter. Natural justice requires that the affected person must be served with a notice. So notice has to be given to him on receipt of the objection

(SRI B. P. GANGADHAR)

and he should be given a chance to substantiate the inclusion of his name in the electoral roll and then only the District Judge can give his finding. All these things will take some time. So I suggest that there should be a period of at least one month left between the last day for filing of nominations and the last day for inclusion of names in the electoral roll so that the District Judge may despose of the matter on receipt of an objection in due time.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—We do not claim any originality for all these things. We are taking almost all the provisions that are existing in the Representation of the People Act. We have got an additional right to amend, modify or cancel or add to any of these rules. I do not think there would be any difficulty of the kind that the hon. Member envisages. If that were to arise I think under our rule making power we can take care of it.

As far as the point raised by the hon. Member Sri Srikantaiah is concerned, when such a rule exists when any aggrieved person goes before the District Judge I am sure any District Judge would be good enough to take into consideration the existence of the rule and dispose of the application early. What happens if it is not disposed of, that is the point the hon. Member has raised. What happens? He loses his right.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—He cannot lose his right.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—According to me he loses his right because the rule says that the electoral roll becomes final on the last day of nomination. If afterwards the District Judge decides, he will not have the right to have his name included in the voters' list and therefore he loses his right.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—Suppose the District Judge comes to the decision that the order passed by the Commissioner is not correct and he directs the Commissioner to include his name and suppose in the meanwhile the elections are already held, will not the election be challenged?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Even otherwise election can be challenged.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Government may make the necessary changes under their rule making power.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I am prepared to discuss this matter with any of the hon. Members and if I am convinced that there is necessity to make any changes, Government will not stand on prestige. We are prepared to make changes by exercising our rule making power.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now I will put the amendment to the House. Before that I would like to know whether the hon. member Sri Srikantaiah would withdraw his amendment now that this official amendment has been moved.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—I am quite willing to accept the suggestion if the Hon. Minister says that he will make the necessary change in the rule. I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That at the end of Rule 6 of Schedule VIII add the following :

" Notwithstanding anything contained in rules 1 to 6 no amendment, transposition or deletion of any entry shall be made or no direction for the inclusion of a name in the electoral roll shall be given after the last date for making nominations for an election in that Division and before the completion of that election."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the clause as amended to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That clause 11, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, ETC.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That clause 1, the long : Title and the enacting formula do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the long Title and the enacting formula were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri B. M. PATIL.—I beg to move :

" That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as amended, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Business of the House

Mr. SPEAKER.—The other Bill has not been reached. I do not know whether the House would like to have it tomorrow.

Sri B. P. GANGADHAR.—Sir, what about the discussion on the Pay Commission Report?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two or three small Bills to be taken up. After the disposal of those Bills, the House may carry on the debate on the Tukol Commission Report. If, unfortunately, the time is not sufficient tomorrow, the discussion on the Pay Commission will be taken up in the next sittings. If the House agrees, I have no objection to that being done.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I had promised some of the hon. Members that they would be given an opportunity to ask for certain explanations from the Hon. Ministers, and the other item on the Agenda is half-an-hour discussion. Which shall we take first?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Explanations from the Ministers, Sir.

Sri K. SANGANA GOUDA (Lingsugur)).—I had given notice of half-an-hour discussion on the Upper Krishna Project.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಇದು ನಭೆಗೆ ಗೌರವ ತರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು, ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳುವುದು ದಿನವಹಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವಾದರೆ ನಾವು ನಾಕ್ಟೆಹೆಟ್ಟಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಇರುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಒದಗಿಸಬಹುದೇ ವಿನಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I had indicated that I do not entertain Zero hour and instead permit one or two matters to be explained. Under the provisions of Rule 312, liberally interpreted, if a notice is given early in the morning, I may permit one or two matters to be explained at the end of the day, and in accordance with that procedure, I am permitting members to ask certain explanations. I wanted to permit one or two members, but today there is a large number. I may permit 4 or 5 hon. Members to ask for certain explanations.

Sri K. H. SRINIVASA (Sagar).—Sir, half-an-hour discussion finds a place in the regular Agenda. I think, it is better to give priority to that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will permit that also, after the explanations are given.

Absence of Ministers at Gandhi Centenary Celebrations at Bangalore

† ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್,—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 27ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಈ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ತತ್ವ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರಪಿತ ಗಾಂಧೀಜಿಯವರ ಶತಾಬ್ದಿ ಉತ್ಸವವನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಸ